

### REMARKS

Claims 10-21 were pending. Claim 19 has been canceled. Claims 24-29 are new. Claims 13-15, 17-18 and 20-21 are withdrawn. Claims 10-12, 16 and 24-29 are currently under examination.

### DRAWINGS

The examiner objected to the drawings under 37 CFR 1.83(a) for not showing every feature of the invention specified in the claims. In response to the examiner's objection the applicants have amended the drawings to include a new FIG. 19. FIG. 19 is a modification of FIG. 10 wherein pressing member 16 and an arrow showing the motion of the pressing member 16 was removed, and a pressing structure similar to pressing member 16 is illustrated in accordance with the fifth embodiment disclosed on page 23, lines 3-12 of the specification. The brief description of the drawings was amended to include addition of FIG. 19. No new matter has been added.

### AMENDMENTS TO THE CLAIMS

Claim 10 has been amended to clarify the scope of the invention. In particular the timepiece recited in claim 10 has been amended to further comprise a power source, an oscillator, and an integrated circuit. Support for this amendment can be found at least on page 7, lines 14-20 of the applicants' specification. Claim 10 was also amended to indicate that the time is indicated with a plurality of hands. Support for this amendment may be found at least on page 10, line 9 to page 11, line 2. No new matter has been added.

Claims 24-29 have been added to clarify the scope of the claimed invention. Support for the technical feature recited in claim 24 can be found at least in FIGS. 2, 3 and 4. Support for the technical features recited in claims 25 and 26 can be found on page 19, lines 12-17. The technical feature recited in claim 27 can be found at least on page 10, line 9 to page 11, line 12. The technical feature recited in claim 28 can be found at least on page 17, line 11 to page 19, line 4. The technical feature recited in claim 29 can be found at least in newly amended claim 10 and claim 24.

### REJECTION UNDER 35 USC §102(e)

The examiner has rejected claims 10-12, 16 and 19 under 35 USC § 102(e) as being anticipated by the U.S. Patent No. 6,885,615 issued Miyazawa et al. (hereinafter *Miyazawa*).

Claim 10 recites a timepiece comprising among other things a vibrator, a driven body and a time indicating mechanism. The vibration of the vibrator drives the driven body. The driven body drives the time indicating mechanism. The time indicating mechanism indicates the time with a plurality of hands.

*Miyazawa* discloses a timepiece including a piezoelectric actuator. *Miyazawa* discloses a calendar display mechanism coupled to a piezoelectric actuator. *Miyazawa*, column 11, lines 11-13. *Miyazawa* also discloses a movement 73, which is not fully described for driving hands 72.


The applicants respectfully disagree with the examiners rejection of claim 10. It appears to be the examiner's opinion that *Miyazawa* discloses hands 72 (time indicating mechanism) which is driven by a rotor 100 (driven body) which is driven by a piezoelectric actuator (vibrator). The applicants respectfully disagree with this characterization of *Miyazawa*. Although *Miyazawa* does disclose a time indicating mechanism, it is not driven by the rotor. The time indicating mechanism is instead driven by a movement 73. *Miyazawa* gives almost no information about movement 73. Furthermore, the rotor 100 drives a calendar display mechanism. The calendar display mechanism is not a time indicating mechanism and does not suggest or disclose a time indicating mechanism driven by a piezoelectric actuator. For at least this reason claim 10 is allowable over *Miyazawa*.

*Miyazawa* discloses both a time indicating mechanism and a date indicating mechanism. *Miyazawa* does not disclose the movement 73 driving the time indicating mechanism. It is reasonable to assume that someone skilled in the art would assume that the rotational driving force of the movement 73 would come from an electromagnetic stepping motor as disclosed on column 1, lines 55-61 of *Miyazawa*. Thus, *Miyazawa* does not suggest or disclose the invention recited in claim 10. By showing both a time indicating mechanism and a date indicating mechanism and only showing a date indicating mechanism coupled to the piezoelectric actuator and not showing the time indicating mechanism coupled to a piezoelectric actuator, *Miyazawa* in fact teaches away from the applicants claimed invention. These are additional reasons as to why claim 10 is allowable over the cited art.

Claims 11, 12, 16 and 24-28 are allowable over the prior art at least because they are dependent upon allowable claim 10. Claim 29 recites among other technical features the patentable features recited in claim 10. For at least this reason claim 29 is patentable over the prior art for at least the same reasons as claim 10.

In view of the foregoing amendments and remarks, Applicants respectfully request favorable reconsideration of the present application.

Respectfully submitted,



Daniel A. Ratoff  
Registration No. 54,389

Please address all correspondence to:

Epson Research and Development, Inc.  
Intellectual Property Department  
150 River Oaks Parkway, Suite 225  
San Jose, CA 95134  
Phone: (408) 952-6000  
Facsimile: (408) 954-9058  
Customer No. 20178

Date: April 24, 2006

**AMENDMENTS TO DRAWINGS:**

The attached drawing sheet includes new FIG. 19.